

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments above because they place the claims in condition for allowance or at least in better condition for appeal. Reconsideration of the present application in view of the amendments and remarks below is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 - 7 and 13 were pending. Claims 1 – 6 and 13 are rejected. Claim 7 is allowable. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 have been amended. Currently, Claims 1 - 7 and 13 are pending in the present application.

Claim 1 has been amended to:

- 1) replace "cycloheteroalkyl" in the definition of R1 with "pyrrolidinyl", and to limit the number of substituents. Support for replacing cycloheteroalkyl with pyrrolidinyl is found on page 14, line 21 of the specification.
- 2) R2, R5 and R6 to limit the number of substituents.
- 3) replace the definition of R7 with the definition of R7 on page 8, lines 19-21.
- 4) replace the definition of R8 with the definition of R8 on page 9, lines 3-7, and to limit the number of substituents.
- 5) replace the definition of Ra with the definition of Ra on page 9, lines 32-33.
- 6) define Rb as R^a and C₁₋₁₀alkyl.
- 7) replace the definition of Rc with the definition of Rc on page 10, lines 30-32.
- 8) replace the definition of Rd with the definition of Rd on page 11, lines 7-9, and limit the number of substituents.
- 9) replace the definitions of Re and Rf with the definitions of Re and Rf on page 11, line 33.
- 10) define Rh as: halogen, C₁₋₁₀alkyl, -ORⁱ, -NRⁱRⁱ, and -OC(O)Rⁱ.
- 11) define Ri as hydrogen, C₁₋₃alkyl, and trifluoromethyl, and limit the number of substituents. Support is found on page 12, lines 20-23.
- 12) delete the definitions of Rk and m.
- 13) define n as 1. Support is found on page 13, line 2.

Claim 2 has been amended to:

- 1) replace the definition of Ra with the definition of Ra on page 9, lines 34-35.
- 2) replace the definition of Rd with the definition of Rd on page 11, lines 10-11.
- 3) replace the definition of Rh with the definitions of Rh and Ri on page 12, lines 7-9.

4) delete the definitions of Rb, Rc, Re and Rf.

Claim 3 has been amended to:

- 1) replace the definition of R1 with the definition of R1 on page 5, lines 20-22.
- 2) add the definition of Ri from page 12, line 24.

Claim 4 has been amended to:

- 1) replace the definition of R7 with the definition of R7 on page 8, lines 22-24.
- 2) add the definitions of R5 and R6 from page 8, lines 1-2.

Claim 5 has been amended to:

- 1) replace the definition of R1 with the definition of R1 on page 5, lines 27-29.
- 2) add the definitions of R5 and R6 from page 8, lines 4-5.
- 3) delete the definition of R4.

These amendments do not add new matter to the present application, and do not raise any new issues of patentability.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 112.

FIRST PARAGRAPH

The Examiner stated that Claims 1-6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the claims still have various substituents for R7, R8, Ra and Rb including very large generic groups, which are then further substituted.

Applicants have amended Claims 1-5 as summarized above. Support for these Claim amendments is found in the specification as indicated. Claims 6 and 13 depend from Claim 1 and incorporate the amendments to Claim 1.

In view of the above amendments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-6 and 13 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are allowable and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to and final rejection of Claims 1-6 and 13.

Serial No.: 10/576,796
Case No.: 21176YP
Page No.: 23

Applicants believe that all of the rejections have been overcome and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Baerbel R. Brown, Reg. # 47449/
Baerbel R. Brown, Reg. No. 47,449
Patent Attorney for Applicants

MERCK & CO., Inc.
P.O. Box 2000
Rahway, New Jersey 07065
Tel.: (732)594-0672

January 22, 2010